



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROFESSOR KAMPHAUSEN ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL.¹

By PROF. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE,
University of the City of New York.

In a recent contribution to the apparently inexhaustible literature on the book of Daniel, Professor D. Adolf Kamphausen of Bonn discusses in the light of modern historical criticism this much disputed portion of Scripture. The first part of his paper is devoted to refuting at some length two opinions of the late Paul de Lagarde, viz: that Daniel is merely a combination of various sections, quite separate in origin, and that the fourth and last kingdom prophesied in the seventh chapter is the Roman Empire.²

Dr. Kamphausen is quite right in regarding the book of Daniel as a connected whole. A comparison of the two recognized divisions of the work, the apocalyptic chapters and the narrative sections, shows plainly their interdependence. It is apparent, for example, that in several places identical prophecies are simply repeated in different forms, in which connection should be mentioned the coincidence of the visions regarding the four kingdoms in chaps. ii. and vii. Moreover, in all the prophecies a period of trial and tribulations is always followed by the triumph of the Lord and his saints. That the apocalyptic chapters themselves form a whole, few since Bertholdt, save Lagarde, have doubted.

The only germ of truth in the dismemberment theory lies in the fact that the Maccabæan author has probably embodied in

¹ *Das Buch Daniel und die neuere Geschichtsforschung. Ein Vortrag mit Anmerkungen*, von D. Adolf Kamphausen, Ord. Prof. der Theologie zu Bonn. Leipzig: Hinrichs 1893, pp. vi. and 46.

² See *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1891, pp. 497-520.

his work a number of originally independent parts, all of which have the same parnetic object in view.

Although probably correct in his idea, that the bilingual character of the book does not presuppose a separate origin for the Aramaic chapters, Kamphausen's explanation of the sudden change of language in chap. ii. 4 is very unsatisfactory. He says (p. 13) that, as both Aramaic and Hebrew were equally well understood at the time when the book was written, the author used whichever language he considered most appropriate to his subject. Thus Aramaic was used for the speech of the Chaldees in chap. ii. and was continued through the parts relating to Babylonian history. Kamphausen hints that the apocalyptic chap. vii. is in Aramaic, because of its close resemblance to the second chapter.

It should be remembered, however, that the second chapter, although containing the account of a similar vision to that in chap. vii., is still narrative in form, while chap. vii. is undoubtedly apocalyptic, and, according to Kamphausen's theory regarding the appropriateness of Hebrew to such literature, should have been in that language. The difficulty, therefore, with this view, which is practically that of Merx, is, that the apocalyptic seventh chapter, which is clearly a part of the prophetic division of the book, is in Aramaic, while, on the other hand, the narrative first chapter is in Hebrew.

The best explanation of the bilingual character of Daniel seems that suggested by Lenormant and adopted by A. A. Bevan (*The Book of Daniel*, 1892, pp. 27ff), that the work was written originally all in Hebrew, and for the convenience of the general reader was then translated into the Aramaic vernacular. It may be supposed that certain parts of the original Hebrew manuscript being lost, the missing sections were supplied from the current Aramaic translation. This theory at least explains the language of the second chapter, without compelling the supposition of an arbitrary change of idiom on the part of the author. It may be mentioned that the idea of an original Hebrew version of Daniel was somewhat sarcastically suggested by Bertholdt as a parallel to P. D. Huetius' view in his

Demonstr. Evang., p. 472, that the entire work was written first in Aramaic and afterwards translated into Hebrew. (Bertholdt, *Comm. on Dan.*, p. 52.)

Kamphausen's statement that the author of Daniel undoubtedly regarded Aramaic as the language of the Chaldeans who ruled in Babylon, and that he could have known nothing of the real Assyro-Babylonian, seems by no means certain.

It is now regarded as possible that the Babylonian language may have been in use, even as a spoken idiom, until and during the first part of the Hellenic period. We have the inscription of Antiochus Soter (280-260 B. C.) in good Babylonian, and it is interesting to notice that a brick from Tello contains a proper name of distinctly Assyrian character engraved in both Aramaic and Greek letters. (See Gutbrod, *ZA.* vi., p. 27.) It does not seem an untenable supposition, therefore, that the Maccabæan author of Daniel, in his reference to the writing of the Chaldees in chap. i. 4, may really have meant the Babylonian cuneiform characters, of which he might have heard or even seen specimens. In this connection it should be mentioned that the comment is inexact which Dr. Kamphausen has made on my brief article about the interpretation of the mysterious sentence in Daniel, v. 25. (*J. H. U. Circulars*, No. 98, p. 94.) He asserts that I there advanced the opinion that the author of Daniel understood the Babylonian language and characters. I merely suggested, however, that the events recorded in Daniel v. may really have taken place at the Babylonian court at the time of the fall of the city, and advanced the hypothesis that the sentence was unintelligible to the wise men because it may have been written ideographically in the Babylonian language. The implication was that the account descended in tradition to the Maccabæan writer of Daniel.

Lagarde's error, that the fourth kingdom in Daniel is not the Greek, but the Roman Empire, Kamphausen has rightly refuted. Because Josephus has not anywhere mentioned chaps. vii., ix.-xi., Lagarde came to the conclusion that chap. vii. was not in existence in the canon at the time of Josephus and was consequently a later insertion referring to the Roman power; an *argumentum ex*

silentio of the boldest sort. To judge the prophecies of chap. vii. apart from the context of the rest of the book, and to apply them in a manner quite at variance with the general tone of the work is against the first principles of true exegesis. There can be little doubt that the allusions of all the other prophetic sections of Daniel refer to the Greek power as the last empire, and to deliberately extract chap. vii. from its context and thus to ignore its close resemblance to chap. ii. seems entirely unwarranted.

The latter part of Kamphausen's lecture is an able, condensed argument against the old idea that the book has its origin in the Achæmenian period. The author might have noted, in his treatment of the name "Darius" in Daniel, that the theory of the historical confusion of Darius Hystaspis, in the biblical allusion to a "Darius the Mede," dates from the eleventh century of our era. Marianus Scotus, the celebrated Benedictine, appears to have held this view.¹

It might also be added here that the interpolation of a Median rule in Babylon directly after its fall may be due to a confusion in the biblical author's mind of the fall of Babylon at the hands of the Persians with the earlier capture and overthrow of Nineveh by the Medes.

Every unprejudiced reader will agree with Professor Kamphausen that, in spite of the unhistorical character of Daniel, the book was certainly not written in vain. If it be remembered that the biblical author really makes no pretense of writing a history, but rather a comforting assurance to his people, groaning under the Syrian tyranny, the book should lose none of its beauty and force.

Kamphausen's lecture may be characterized as a clear and concise exposition of the best modern views regarding the book of Daniel and it will certainly prove a valuable introduction to the critical study of that work.

¹ See Bertholdt, *Comm. on Daniel*, p. 844.